

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are all the claims pending in the present application, new claims 22 and 23 having been added as indicated herein. The Examiner considered the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment and found those arguments to be persuasive. However, the Examiner has issued the present Office Action indicating new grounds of rejection. Specifically, in the present Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,738,081).<sup>1</sup> Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Wambach et al. (US Patent No. 6,097,369). Finally, claims 11, 12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gupta in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, “Dynamic Time-Dependent User Interface Modification”, January 1994 (“IBM”).

**§102(e) Rejections (Gupta) - Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-16, and 21**

Claims 1-7, 10, 13-15 and 21 are rejected for the reasons set forth on pages 2-9 of the present Office Action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

Briefly, Gupta is directed to a method of displaying a defined selected region 20 of a subject image 3 (*see Fig. 2 of Gupta*). According to Applicants understanding, the Examiner believes that the portion of the screen 20 that is within the masking portions 12, 13, 14, and 15 corresponds to the claimed pointing screen, and the Examiner believes that the selected region 20 can be adjusted (*see Fig. 3 of Gupta*).

---

<sup>1</sup> On page 2, the Examiner mistakenly indicates that only claims 1-6, 7, 13-15, and 21 are rejected as being anticipated by Gupta.

With respect to claim 1, based on Applicants' understanding of Gupta and the Examiner's rejections, Applicants submit that Gupta does not teach or suggest at least, "determining whether desired information to be pointed at is included in the set pointing screen," and "pointing at the desired information included in the pointing screen when it is determined that the desired information is included in the pointing screen or after step (c)," as recited in claim 1. Even though, as indicated above, Gupta appears to disclose a region 20 that is selectable, nowhere does Gupta disclose that a determination is made as to whether desired information to be pointed at is included in the set pointing screen. Further, nowhere does Gupta even mention pointing at any type of information in the pointing screen 20. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the operations (b) and (d) of claim 1 are not disclosed in Gupta.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-7, 9, 10, and 13-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective indirect or direct dependencies from independent claim 1.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 10, Applicants submit that the feature of an initial position, which is initially pointed at within the pointing screen, being set is not disclosed in Gupta. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the region 20 of Gupta corresponds to the claimed pointing screen, nowhere does Gupta disclose that there is a particular initial position within the selected region 20 that is set. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Gupta does not anticipate claim 10.

With respect to independent claim 21, Applicants submit that Gupta does not disclose at least, "an information selection step of creating a pointing screen at a portion of a full screen at a user's option such that the pointing screen includes at least one piece of information to be executed," as recited in claim 21. Gupta only indicates that there is an image within the selected

region 20 (Fig. 2 of Gupta), however nowhere does Gupta disclose that this particular image 3 is to be executed. Further, the Examiner alleges that Gupta teaches that when the user selects the information inside the mask, a text file is opened describing the information shown in the window. However, upon Applicants review of Gupta, nowhere does Gupta disclose that a user selects the information inside the mask to bring up a corresponding text file. At least based on the foregoing, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 21 and submit that independent claim 21 is patentably distinguishable over Gupta.

**§103(a) Rejections (Gupta/Wambach) - Claims 8**

Claim 8 is rejected for the reasons set forth on pages 9-10 of the present Office Action. Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable at least by virtue of its indirect dependency from independent claim 1. Wambach does not make up for the deficiencies of Gupta.

**§103(a) Rejections (Gupta/IBM) - Claims 11, 12 and 17-20**

Claims 11, 12 and 17-20 are rejected for the reasons set forth on pages 10-13 of the present Office Action.

First, Applicants submit that dependent claims 11, 12 and 17-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their indirect or direct dependencies from independent claim 1. IBM does not make up for the deficiencies of Gupta.

Further, with respect to dependent claims 11 and 19, Applicants submit that IBM does not disclose or suggest the specific features set forth in each of these claims. That is, even if, *arguendo*, Gupta discloses that the cursor speed can be set, and a cursor is used to select a window, it does not necessarily follow that the movement of the pointing screen would be the same as the set cursor speed. A set speed at which a pointing screen is moved could override any


set cursor speed, therefore the set cursor speed is not necessarily the same as the set speed of a pointing screen. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the features of claims 11 and 19 are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references, either alone or in combination.

Finally, Applicants add new claims 22 and 23 to provide a varying scope of coverage. Applicants submit that these new claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 15, 2005